

**KENTUCKY BOARD OF EDUCATION
REGULAR MEETING
MAY 16, 17 AND 18, 2005**

**KENTUCKY DAM VILLAGE STATE PARK
GILBERTSVILLE, KENTUCKY**

SUMMARY MINUTES

The Kentucky Board of Education held a regular meeting on May 16, 17 and 18, 2005, at Kentucky Dam Village State Park in Gilbertsville, Kentucky. The Board conducted the following discussions:

Monday, May 16, 2005

SCHOOL VISITS

Commissioner Wilhoit, Chair Keith Travis, Vice-Chair Hilma Prather, Janice Allen and Bonnie Lash Freeman participated in school visits to Marshall County, McCracken County and Paducah Independent Districts.

PUBLIC FORUM

The commissioner and board members held a public forum at the Kentucky Dam Village Convention Center from 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. (CDT) for the superintendents and staff of the West Kentucky Educational Cooperative districts. Approximately 83 persons attended the forum. Questions were posed from the audience with the commissioner and various board members responding.

Tuesday, May 17, 2005

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Keith Travis called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Present for the meeting were Janice Allen, Bonnie Lash Freeman, Jeff Mando, Helen Mountjoy, Hilma Prather, David Rhodes, David Tachau, Keith Travis, Janna Vice and David Webb. Absent were Dorie Combs and Tom Layzell.

***KENTUCKY'S FUTURE/DATA IMPACTING EDUCATION TO BE CONSIDERED
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE KBE'S PRIORITIES FOR 2005-06***

Chair Travis turned the morning session over to Ron Crouch from the Kentucky State Data Center at the University of Louisville to share data with members that could impact

the setting of the board's 2005-06 priorities. Mr. Crouch made the following summary points in his data presentation:

- Major changes are on the horizon for Kentucky.
- Key areas in which students must have competency are critical thinking skills, understanding trends over time, recognizing the magnitude of problems (\$100 versus \$1 issues) and recognizing the big picture (seeing strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats).
- Only 1 in 3 homes in Kentucky have children (implications for education).
- The amount of population in the 65+ category in Kentucky is an issue; 80% of Kentucky's population growth is in this category.
- The majority of all future growth will occur in the South.
- The majority of growth under age 45 is occurring in minorities (Black/Hispanic; major implications for education).
- Young men are not as prepared for the new knowledge economy as young women are.
- The Southeast has the best improvement in educational level.
- The replacement of retired teachers with young teachers is a major issue.
- Kentucky needs to invest in educating its minority population.
- Kentucky is making progress in educational attainment but is still behind the national level.
- In rural areas, the young are better educated than the old.
- Future jobs will require brainpower, not muscle.
- Employers indicated a need exists for employees to have good communication skills.
- How to convince adults to increase funding for education is a major issue.
- People must be reinvented.

LEGISLATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE KBE'S PRIORITIES FOR 2005-06

The co-chairs of the Interim Joint Education Committee attended the meeting and presented their perspectives on what issues should impact the setting of the board's priorities for 2005-06. Senator Ken Winters presented first and made the following points:

- The changing role of senior citizens must be recognized.
- Improving the performance of high school students and the successful transition to postsecondary education are extremely important.
- Improvements must be made to the writing portfolio to deal with the concerns of constituents.
- The public needs to feel it has ownership in Kentucky's education system.
- A rollout of enhanced education reform is needed.
- Technology funding must be addressed.
- SEEK funding must be increased.

- Schools must be able to respond to the unique needs of students quickly.
- Teachers need to be supported in dealing with classroom issues.
- Grading systems from district to district need to be standardized.
- The highly skilled educator program needs to be reviewed.
- The choice issue should be discussed.

Representative Frank Rasche then shared his perspective as follows:

- Assessment and accountability issues are one of the primary areas that must be addressed.
 - The first time the state opted for school accountability.
 - Additionally, a standards-based approach was chosen.
 - The state is now facing the reaction to the above choices with constituents asking for individual testing, tests that take less time and tests that can be scored faster.
 - The No Child Left Behind Act has created a sellers market in testing.
 - High stakes accountability is the only thing that has changed practice.
 - The board is facing a fork in the road; however, thinking simpler/cheaper is the wrong way to go.
 - The biggest challenge is to implement a system that takes the state in the direction it needs to go but satisfies the critics.
 - The portfolio is another major issue; it is the only part of the assessment over which teachers feel they have control. Problems exist in not knowing whose work is actually in the portfolio, the student's or teacher's. A way of assessment needs to be found that gets us back to good teaching and addresses weaknesses in knowing grammar skills.

Following the presentations by Dr. Winters and Representative Rasche, a dialogue occurred on how to improve communications between the legislature and the board and how to work together toward the same goals.

CATS RFP ISSUES

The board had an extensive discussion on the issues that need to determine the content for the new CATS Request for Proposal (CATS). The following guidance to staff resulted via consensus:

1. The KBE has directed the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) to improve the Kentucky Core Content for Assessment.

At the Board's direction, KDE staff has undergone a thorough process of improving the Core Content for Assessment - to make it clearer and more focused, to provide additional cognitive clarity, and to align it with the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the American Diploma Project (ADP), the ACT, and other national work. This alignment work has included the work of the Pre-K to 16 Council regarding joint efforts on higher education/preK

– 12 issues and KDE work with the Council on Postsecondary Education, such as the Mathematics Education Summit.

2. The KBE will expand the purpose of CATS beyond a school accountability to include additional student-based measures.

The KBE will develop a new design that will be based on a number of common items taken by all students that will be scored and released to schools, supplemented by matrix items that are necessary to equate the test across forms and for pre-testing purposes. The common items could be used to provide instructional information to teachers that could be compared across all students in their class and that could be used as determined appropriate by local school districts to measure student accountability.

3. The KBE approves moving from 100% per year Core Content coverage to a model that would allow more flexibility (a. 100%-85% or b. one or two years).

The Board is willing to look at less than 100% coverage but would not likely approve a model that allowed for less than 80 – 85% coverage. The Board wishes to ensure that teachers are provided with clear and sufficient information about what is “fair game” for the assessment so that they do not feel they must guess what to teach.

4. The KBE will consider a change to the number of on-demand writing prompts or how we assess on-demand writing.

The Board would consider a change in the number and format of on-demand prompts, but would not be willing to increase the amount of time on the test attributed to on-demand writing to greater than the currently allotted ninety minutes. As NTAPAA indicated that more than a single prompt would be necessary to maintain validity and reliability, the Board will not approve a design including the use of a single prompt, but prefers the use of a single long prompt and one or two shorter prompts. The Board prefers that students be given as much choice as possible (possibly three prompt choices) for the long prompt, that at the high school level that the long prompt focus on analysis. A variety of formats (such as those presented at the April KBE meeting) may be explored for the shorter prompts.

5. The KBE prefers that the KCCT test design include a core of common items to provide additional student level results and matrix items for coverage of core content, equating and pretesting.

The Board is committed to the concept of inclusion of both common and matrix items. The Board also strongly recommends that staff carefully consider the numbers of common and matrix open response and multiple-choice items to assure KDE has achieved the minimum amount of testing time necessary to assure

valid and reliable assessment of students and to achieve the goals and priorities of the KBE. To this end, the Board has directed staff to maximize the use of multiple-choice items to assess higher order thinking skills.

6. The KBE wishes to continue emphasizing higher order skills while assigning greater weight to open response items.

As the number of open response questions on the assessment decreases, the Board understands that it is less likely that the NTAPAA will support the current weighting of 67% for the open response and 33% for the multiple choice items. Thus, the Board expresses a preference for a 50% – 50% weighting for open response and multiple-choice items, understanding that the level of difficulty of the multiple-choice items and their use to assess higher-order thinking skills will increase.

7. If possible, the KBE wishes the state to pursue an embedded NRT for a longitudinal measure in Reading and Mathematics.

The Board understands that Kentucky's participation in the National Governor's Association's Center for Best Practices *Honor States Grant Program* may in the future allow for the thirteen states involved to work together to provide different mechanisms for norming. The Board is willing to look at different options for providing the NRT component and is supportive of bidding the NRT both as a separate, stand alone process and an embedded process to see the time, cost and processes required for each option.

8. The KBE wishes staff to initiate pilot studies to develop and/or identify assessment approaches in Arts and Humanities and Practical Living/Vocational Studies that will address what students do as well as what they know in these areas.

The Board supports bidding both a new means to assess these areas as well as including a process to bid on the old means of assessing these areas in the event that bid proposals for a new type of assessment are time or cost-prohibitive. The Board wishes to maintain the current weight of these assessments in the overall process, but is willing to consider a new means for assessing that collects different information and measures performance in a different way. The Board wishes to assure that any new means of assessment is clearly focused on relevance and would prefer, if possible, that it provide some time relief to schools and students.

9. The KBE wishes staff to include in the RFP a predictive measure of college success.

The Board supports the provision of a predictive measure of college success.

10. The KBE has directed staff to make improvements in the Writing Portfolio process.

The improvements will include fewer student entries in the portfolio; a change from an holistic to an analytical scoring measure to provide more specific feedback to students and teachers; alignment at the high school level with expectations of higher education; more specific and increased professional development for teachers; and revisions to statewide regulations and dissemination of specific guidelines for portfolio administration to reduce the amount of inappropriate assessment practices relative to the portfolio.

PROPOSED OPTIONS FOR THE OTHER ACADEMIC INDICATOR

Deputy Commissioner Linda France explained that the Assessment Committee, at its April meeting, requested that a different proposal for changing the other academic indicator come forward to the retreat for consideration by the full board. She indicated that the proposed changes to 703 KAR 5:001, 703 KAR 5:020 and 703 KAR 5:130 would come to the June meeting for final approval. France focused on the content of the new proposal on the other academic indicator and summarized it as follows:

The CATS biennial classification and CATS mid-point classification could serve as the criteria for meeting the other academic indicator at the elementary and middle school levels. Schools classified in the Progressing or Meets Goal categories would be considered as meeting the requirement of the other academic indicator at the elementary and middle school levels. Schools classified in the Assistance category would be considered as not meeting the requirement for the other academic indicator. In 2005, the 2004 CATS biennial classification would be used and in 2006, the 2005 CATS mid-point classification would be used.

Via consensus, the board asked that this proposal and the others contained within the staff note be brought back to the June meeting for consideration of final approval.

Wednesday, May 18, 2005

STRATEGIC PLAN DISCUSSION/SETTING OF 2005-06 PRIORITIES

Chair Travis first asked Commissioner Wilhoit to review the strategic plan progress and previous priorities.

Commissioner Wilhoit made the following major points:

- When the board did its strategic plan, the goal was to have every student reach proficiency or beyond. Three goals resulted and leverage points were selected to reach the goals.
- The three goals within the board's strategic plan are still appropriate.
 - Some of the indicators under each goal are more appropriate than others.
 - The department should be able to point to activities for each indicator.

- Some of the indicators are very aggressive and might need to be reconsidered.
- The board and department need to pay close attention to the areas within the plan where progress is behind schedule and interventions may need to occur.

At this point, Carolyn Witt Jones, Executive Director of the Partnership for Kentucky Schools, assumed leadership of the session as facilitator. Board members were asked to express any concerns or input on the goals/indicators of the current strategic plan. The main points that came forward were:

- Involvement of parents is one of the areas in which progress is behind and thus needs attention.
- The approach for the priorities needs to be a comprehensive focus on the parts of the plan to emphasize in the coming year.
- The three goals are still appropriate; other groups need to be involved to assist with the parent piece.
- A traditional approach was used for the parent piece originally and this may not be the approach to secure the most impact. Getting parents directly involved in students' education seems to be supported by research as giving the best results. Our approach needs to be rethought with improvement of the Individual Graduation Plan process to include direct parent involvement.
- Data may need to be collected differently.
- Alignment of KBE's work with the American Diploma Project and other national efforts needs to be part of the board's priority setting.

As to the mission and vision of the plan, the members were asked to review these for appropriateness. The consensus was that these are still appropriate. It was agreed that the indicators would be examined in a more in-depth discussion via a committee of the board. It was also agreed that the annual report on the strategic plan needs an addendum that would include the mission and vision. Other areas of agreement included the continuation of the strategic plan at-a-glance progress chart as a tool for the board in its planning and the continuation of the annual progress report on the strategic plan.

After much discussion, the board reached consensus on the following priorities for 2005-06:

- High school redesign
- Leadership (both building and teacher)
- Early childhood
- Reading/Literacy (middle, high and early childhood)
- Achievement gap (barriers to learning)

Within each of the priority areas, Commissioner Wilhoit proposed that staff look at the following areas in developing action plans:

- Communication/Partnerships (weave in alignment)
- Resources (includes technology)
- Regulations

- Research/Professional development/Learning
- Role of board members

By consensus, the board agreed to both the priority areas listed above and the areas within each priority under which action plans would be developed.

Before leaving the strategic plan discussion, the following members were appointed to a committee that would examine the indicators within the plan in a more in-depth manner: David Webb, Helen Mountjoy, Bonnie Lash Freeman and Dorie Combs. The committee members agreed to conduct their work as part of regular meetings.

REVIEW OF MEETING FORMAT AND COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

After discussing the pros and cons of the current meeting format and committee structure, the board agreed by consensus to a compromise approach where the number of committees would be reduced to two and the substantive issues would be discussed by the full board. It was agreed that the committees would meet on the morning of the first day, one at a time, so that all members can hear the discussions, followed by the full board on the first afternoon and second day. Agreement was reached that the KSB/KSD Committee and the Audit Committee would meet periodically as needed. Staff was asked to implement the new format in August.

REVIEW OF THE KBE POLICY MANUAL

Agreement was reached for staff to incorporate the new language on the nomination committee as amended by the Board and the new language making the technical change from “Policy Coordinator” to “Policy Advisor” into the KBE’s Policy Manual and bring the amended manual back to the board for approval at the June meeting.

REVIEW OF THE DRAFT COMMISSIONER’S EVALUATION TOOL

Agreement was reached to make amendments to the evaluation tool as specified in the discussion and to use it as a discussion tool, and not the evaluation of record. It is to serve as an organizer for each member. The revised tool along with a copy of the commissioner’s current contract and previous evaluation need to be sent to each member in advance of the August meeting.

REVIEW OF MEETING DATES FOR 2005 AND 2006 AND CONSIDERATION OF MEETING DATES FOR 2007

After a review of the 2005 and 2006 dates, staff was asked to make the following changes:

- Add a July 6, 2005, meeting that will focus on the assessment RFP
- Delete the September 14, 2005, meeting
- Change the April 5-6, 2006, meeting to April 11-12, 2006
- Change the March 8, 2006, meeting to March 6, 2006

Staff was asked to leave the 2007 dates as proposed. Additionally, staff is to bring the amended meeting dates proposal to the June meeting for approval.

ADJOURNMENT

The retreat meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.